

(October 31, 2012)

Rough Draft

Gender Reality vs. Gender Ideology

American Catholic Philosophical Association

The Role of Catholic Philosophy in the Formation of Seminarians

Friday, November 3, 2012

Marina del Rey, California

Sr. Prudence Allen, RSM

Text

Introduction

The present conflict between what I call 'Gender Reality' and 'Gender Ideology' is the result of two different views of the human person. Gender Reality holds that human beings are 'always or for the most part' women or men, female or male. Gender Ideology holds that human beings fall along a continuum of 3, 5, or even 15 different loose groups. Gender reality is rooted philosophically in a descriptive metaphysics and Gender Ideology is rooted philosophical in a revisionary metaphysics. Finally, Gender reality depends upon a hylomorphic (soul/body unity) description of a human person, woman or man; while Gender Ideology depends upon a deconstructionist approach to the human person as a loose collection of qualities, attributes, or accidents.

This conflict between Gender Reality and Gender Ideology is serious and in need of careful philosophical analysis. It began basically in the social sciences, and has spread through pseudo-sciences, and finally through journalists back into philosophy and theology. Few, if any, philosophers have grappled with the errors in reasoning and assumptions of various forms of gender ideology. This lack within the philosophical community has allowed harmful effects of Gender Ideology to roam freely and unfortunately to contribute to increase in the culture of death.

In this presentation, I will trace the history of gender and its relation to sex, and identify central arguments put forth by gender ideologists. Where possible I will make preliminary judgments about errors, fallacies, or other distortions in these arguments. Finally, I will present my own argument for a proper approach to gender identity and its relation to sex identity, and will encourage a collective effort of philosophers to ransom gender from its current ideological pitfall.

The Realization of Gender: Distinction between Concept of Gender and Word 'Gender'

Historical Development of The Concept of Gender

In Western history, the root of the word 'gender' can be easily seen in Athens and Jerusalem. In Aristotle's *Generation of Animals* the Greek philosopher, using the philosophical method of observation of the senses and reason, attempted to explain how human generation occurred through the union of male and female. While he wrongly thought that women provided no fertile seed (not discovering ovulation), and he wrongly thought that men provided only one seed for each act of intercourse, Aristotle nonetheless understood the root of generation of 'gen' to be due the union of male and female, with the male generating outside the self and the female generating inside the self. This root 'gen' in generation evolved over time to the notion of gens which implies an intergenerational family group.

In the Book of *Genesis*, the author, drawing upon faith and reason, described the creation of the human being (man) as male and female. The root 'gen' in Hebrew, in addition to implying the beginning in *Genesis* 1, also implied through the book of *Generations* in *Genesis* 5, the beginning of the account of history, flowing from one generation to another. Ultimately this way

of recording history led to the saving event of the Incarnation, Death, and Resurrection of Jesus Christ.

While the philosophical use of the root 'gen' focused on how theories about how generation occurred through the cooperation of male and female, the theological use of the root 'gen' focused on why generation was so important to man, woman, God, and salvation history.

We could say then that the seed for the concept of gender in Western thought was planted around two-thousand-five hundred years ago in Athens and in Jerusalem with only the root 'gen.' In thinking about language, Heidegger observed that: "Words are wellsprings that are found and dug up in the telling, wellsprings that must be found and dug up again and again, that easily cave in, but that at times also well up when least expected." like , not buckets."¹ I will argue that the root 'gen' is a great fountain for the flourishing of the human being and the human race.

~~A~~ ^{my} longitudinal study of the concept of woman in relation to man, reveals three distinct historical periods in the development of the concept of gender identity. In the first phase, lasting from 750BC-1450AD women and men were distinguished by the single reference point of female in relation to male.² In the second period, from approximately 1450 to 1850, characteristics referred to as feminine and masculine were culturally identified, and applied to human beings, either with direct sex association as in masculine male or feminine female, or with indirect sex association as in masculine female or feminine male. These various masculine or feminine characteristics exemplify the concept of cultural gender. Often they were positively

¹ Martin Heidegger, *What is Called Thinking?* (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), Part II, Lecture II, 130.

² See Sr. Prudence Allen, RSM, *The Concept of Woman: The Aristotelian Revolution (750BC-1250AD)* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985/2007).

attributed to the opposite sex as in “Be manly sisters!” And sometimes they were negatively attributed to the opposite sex as in satirical attributions to effeminate men.³ This development can be understood as analogous to moving from a single point reference to a flat triangular model of female, feminine, masculine and male, masculine, feminine.)

(The third development of the *concept* of gender began in the nineteenth century and has lasted until the present. Drawing from principles of existentialism and personalism, a woman or a man are described as *self-defining* to the extent that each one selects which characteristics to integrate into one’s own personality. Simply stated, a woman could think I want to be (or do not want to be) like my aunt, mother, teacher, etc. with respect to characteristic a, b, or c; and a man think I want to be (or do not want to be) like my father, uncle, teacher, etc with respect Here the person can be seen as analogous to a three-dimensional being, with interior space who decides which culturally feminine or masculine characteristics to integrate.) In the early 10th century authors like Edith Stein or Karl Jung made the argument that either a woman or a man could integrate both masculine and feminine characteristics. However, in the later 20th century Karol Wojtyla/John Paul II made convincing arguments that feminine is the way each woman acts in the world; and masculine is the way each man works in the world. In addition, he argued further that the meaning of a woman’s femininity is fulfilled in spiritual/or biological maternity; and the meaning of a man’s masculinity is fulfilled in spiritual and/or biological paternity.

[In this three phased historical development of the *concept* of gender, sex identity in a female or male human being is *integrated* by the human person *qua* woman or *qua* man. The

³ Sr. Prudence Allen, *The Concept of Woman: Volume II: The Early Humanist Reformation, 1250-1500* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002).

person has a substantial identity as either a male or a female person, who engenders particular characteristics in a unique way.

Historical Development of the Word 'Gender'

The word 'gender' has a different time line from the concept of gender. The pre-Socratic sophist Protagoras (490-420BC) introduced the link between language and masculine, feminine, and neutral kinds of words, but he did not use the word 'gender.' Nearly a millennium later, the NeoPlatonist Nicholas of Cusa (1401-1464) introduced a theory within which masculinity and femininity operated within a 'coincidence of opposites', and masculine and feminine had intellectual independence from bodily distinctions of male and female.

A century later satirical literature began to explore the intersection of language with male and female identity in the infamous 1595 *Disputatio nova contra mulieres, qua probatur eas homines non esse* [A New Disputation Against Women, Which Proves that They are Not Human]. This satire contains 50 repeated *reductio ad absurdum* arguments as a simultaneous parody on scholastic disputation among Catholic scholars (referred to as Papists) and Biblical literalists (referred to as Anabaptists) written by an author with a Lutheran background. This satire was refuted in 1641 in 'Defense of the Female sex' by Simon Gedicci, S.T.D and the two arguments together were reprinted up to the end of the 18th century. In 1938 Dorothy Sayers offered a further refutation on the theme of the relation of women, men and the human in, *Are Women Human?: Astute and Witty Essays on the Role of Women in Society*.

The first literary work I have found to introduce the word 'gender' directly describing the distinction between woman and man is the 1620 text published in England entitled *Hic Mulier*,

The anonymous author of this pamphlet rather extraordinarily links the English words *genders* and *generations* to women's identity in a way that anticipates the twentieth-century application of the word 'gender' to a woman's and a man's respective identities.

For since the days of Adam women were never so masculine; masculine in their *genders* and whole *generations*, from the Mother, to the youngest daughter; masculine in number, from one to multitudes; masculine in case, even from the head to the foot; masculine in mood, from both speech, to impudent action; and masculine in tense: for (without redress) they were, are, and will be still most masculine, most mankind, and most monstrous.⁴

This satire not only joins the linguistic categories of masculine and feminine endings directly to men's and women's identities, but also the linguistic categories of number, case, mood, and tense to various aspects of a woman's identity.

Haec Vir is the second of the three satirical pamphlets focusing on man-woman identities. Its full title captures well its purpose and method: *Haec-Vir: Or The Womanish-Man: Being an answer to a late Book intituled Hic-Mulier. Exprest in a briefe Dialogue between Haec-Vir the Womanish-Man, and Hic-Mulier the Man-Woman.* This satire begins with both the woman and the man assuming falsely the gender of the other one— the man thinking he is talking to a man, instead of a woman; and the woman thinking she is talking to a woman, instead of a man. The reasons for these errors are the clothes and bearing of the bodies of the persons being addressed. It is generally assumed that satirizing a masculine woman and a feminine man were directly associated with the personas of Queen Victoria and King James.

⁴ *Hic Mulier*, A3, in Henderson and McManus, 265. Italics and bold my emphasis.

In C.S. Lewis's, Perelandra, written in 1943 as part of his science fiction trilogy, the narrator (who is thought to be Lewis himself) reflects on the meaning of "gender" and its relation to "sex":

Gender is a reality, and a more fundamental reality than sex. Sex is, in fact, merely the adaptation to organic life of a fundamental polarity which divides all created beings. Female sex is simply one of the things that have feminine gender; there are many others, and Masculine and Feminine meet us on planes of reality where male and female would be simply meaningless. Masculine is not attenuated male and female attenuated female. On the contrary, the male and female of organic creatures are rather faint and blurred reflections of masculine and feminine.⁵

The Neoplatonic text *The Cosmographia* of Bernardus Silvestris is commonly thought to be the source for *Perelandra* and the other texts in his Space Trilogy.

By 1949, in Male and Female, the anthropologist Margaret Mead claimed that sex-roles or sex-styles were simply culturally learned. In just one example she argued: "Characteristic after characteristic in which the differences within a sex are so great that there is enormous overlapping are artificially assigned as masculine or feminine."⁶ Mead's conclusion about the relativism of sex roles and sex identities flowed over into a reflection on the word 'gender' itself. She introduced the word 'gender' in a discussion about polygamy when she posited the difficulty a person has to imagine contrasts in other societies. In her words: "We know by sad experience how difficult it is for those who have been reared in within one civilization ever to get outside its categories, to imagine, for instance, what a language could be like that had thirteen genders. Oh,

⁵ C.S. Lewis, *Perelandra: A Novel* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1944), 214.

⁶ Margaret Mead, *Male and Female: A Study of the Sexes in a Changing World* (1949), 373.

yes, one says masculine, feminine, and neuter—and what in the world are the other ten?⁷ In this hypothetical question, Margaret Mead set the world stage, perhaps unknowingly, for the mutation of gender ideology to begin.

Contemporary Challenge: To Use or Not to Use the Word 'Gender'

point to this
It is obvious to anyone today who fills out an application for university, makes a reservation to fly, or even applies for a visa to visit another country, that the category 'gender' is widely used with the two sub-categories of male or female to be checked off by the applicant. Recently I have seen a third option, labeled as 'other', 'don't know', or 'neither'. This would allow for the very few persons with an ambivalent or intersex identity not to be forced to choose either male or female when it is not an accurate description of their legal identity. The third category in these circumstances is a compassionate response to persons who are a very small minority of human beings in the general population and who suffer from a deep personal affliction.

In the past, instead of the word 'gender' as the main category on such applications it would have been identified simply as 'sex' and the sub categories as 'male' or 'female.' The common place use of the word 'gender' means that a major shift in language has occurred which we philosophers need to paid heed to for vary serious reasons that I will explain below. I became aware of this shift from the use of the word 'sex' to 'gender' in 1990 in philosophical publications when I was asked by an editor of a journal to defend my use of the word 'sex'

⁷ Mead, *Male and Female: A Study of the Sexes in a Changing World* (Harper Collins, 1949), 13. Bold my emphasis.

instead of 'gender' in an article I had submitted for publication. So I did some research on this, just within philosophical publications, and understood that there had been a change. However, since I did not look outside the field of philosophy, I did not realize the original reasons for the change had come through the social sciences, especially anthropology, psychology, and sociology. In fact this is a real inversion of the history of philosophy in which the philosophy of Aristotle had been the major influence on the development of sciences and Rene Descartes and John Locke, while influenced by mathematical and empirical sciences respectively, also influenced the development of social sciences and especially psychology in its early years.

Consequently, the article I wrote and submitted for publication in 1992, titled "Sex or Gender? Some Philosophical Implications" was rejected by two journals with good reasons. I put it aside and only decided to return to it twenty-years later. This time I ventured outside of philosophical texts in an effort to understand the roots and arguments in authors in anthropology, psychology, sociology and political science and to consider how best to respond to them as a philosopher and more specifically as a philosopher who teaches in a seminary. What follows is a preliminary draft of results of this research.

The Medicalization of Gender: Dr. John Money and the Roots of Gender Ideology

Arguing from the Exception to the Rule about Gender Gate

By the next decade, John Money, a young man from New Zealand, who likely knew of Mead's research his area of the world, came to the United States to complete a doctorate in Psychology at Harvard on the study of hermaphrodites. Soon after his graduation in 1952, Dr.

Money was hired at John's Hopkins university Medical School. His first study in the new Psychohormonal Research ^{unit} there was on 131 intersex individuals (persons born with ambiguous biological anatomical sexual characteristics.)

In 1955, in the first published paper from Johns Hopkins on this research project, Dr. Money argued directly from the study of hermaphrodites ^{to} a conclusion about normal males and females, namely that gender identity is environmentally caused during the approximately two years of life:

From the sum total of hermaphroditic evidence ... **the conclusion that emerges** is that sexual behavior and orientation as male or female does not have an innate, instinctive basis. In place of a theory of instinctive masculinity or femininity which is innate, **the evidence of hermaphroditism lends support to a conception that, psychologically, sexuality is undifferentiated at birth and that it becomes differentiated as masculine or feminine in the course of the various experiences of growing up.**⁸

Money later called this time frame of approximately two years from birth to the settling of one's sexual and gender identity as the gender gate or gender window.

Twenty years after his original studies, in a text published in 1975, *Sexual Signatures: On Being a Man or a Woman*: Dr. Money continued to argue from the exception to the rule:

✗ Convincing evidence that the gender identity gate was wide open when you were born and stayed open for some time thereafter can be found in matched pairs of hermaphrodites... Only a few years from the same sexual start, one of each pair has become a boy, the other a girl. They develop into men and women as different from each other as normal men are different from normal women

But is the gate also open for those who were sexually normal at birth? Transsexuals give the answer—yes.⁹

⁸ John Money, Doctoral Dissertation on *Hermaphroditism: An Inquiry into the Nature of a Human Paradox*, in John Colapinto, *As Nature Made Him: The Boy Who Was Raised as a Girl* (New York/London/Toronto/Sydney: Harper Perennial, 2000/2001), 33-34. My emphasis.

⁹ John Money and Patricia Tucker, *Sexual Signatures: On Being a Man or a Woman* (Boston and Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, 1975), 90-91.

Money's method of arguing from the exception (hermaphrodites) to the rule (either male or female) is the first error of reasoning that we encounter in his work. Aristotle recognized long ago, that science of nature recognizes that there are grey areas which do not allow for universal affirmative definitions and AAA syllogisms. Instead, "all science is of that which is always or for the most part."¹⁰ So in the situation of hermaphrodites or intersexed human beings, we can see ways in which differentiation as male or female does not naturally happen in some small number of cases, but to argue from them to a theory about all human beings would be fallacious.

The logical error of appealing to hermaphrodites to defend claims about normal human beings in general is also found in the writings of Michel Foucault. Although only using the word 'sex' rather than 'gender' Foucault considered the concept of one's identity as male or female. He analyzed a personal diary written by Alexina-Herculine Barbin born in 1838. Alexina discovered after puberty that she had developed male anatomy and physiology. A very kind Bishop and Msgr. together helped Hercule to change civil status from female to male, and to try to establish himself in Paris with a new male identity. Changing from a dynamic and loving community at girl's school where Alexina was preparing to become a teacher, Herculine experienced extreme loneliness, missing especially those girl-friends and family members with whom he had been close for around 20 years. The depression following led to his suicide in 1868, after he wrote his diary detailing the agony of his life. Michel Foucault's response to the genuine suffering of Alexina and then Hercule Barbin was to argue that the categories of sex as

¹⁰ Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, in *The Basic Works of Aristotle*, ed. Richard McKeon (New York: Random House, 1941).1065a2-6.

either male or female should simply be abolished for everyone. Foucault's first words in the Introduction are: "Do we *truly* need a *true* sex? With a persistence that borders on stubbornness, modern Western societies have answered in the affirmative."¹¹ Here again, we see the move from an exception to the general rule.

Returning Dr. John Money's approach to Gender Identity, in the late 1950's Dr. Money's research methods, and in particular, his move from a study of hermaphrodites to conclusions about gender identity among all human beings came under attack from two independent medical research teams in 1958 in Kansas and in 1959 in Toronto.¹² Consequently when a Canadian couple from Winnipeg with identical twin boys, Bruce and Brian Reimer, who were born in 1965, had one son (Bruce), through a poorly performed circumcision lose his penis, consulted with Dr. Money, he recommended trying to bring up the wounded son as a girl and not revealing in any way this change to either of the 22 month old children. Dr. Money thought he had found his perfect controlled experiment to prove his gender identity theory.

To summarize briefly, the wounded child Bruce's name was changed to Brenda, and he was castrated in 1967. In spite of Dr. Money's projected goal of helping this normal male child grow up as a 'normal' female, he/she fought the change continuously. By 1970, he was not adjusting well to being told he was a she. He was a physical fighter, hitting and attacking others, and actually defending his brother. It is at this point that evidence begins to manifest itself that

¹¹ Michel Foucault, *Herculine Barbin: Being the Recently Discovered Memoirs of a Nineteenth-Century French Hermaphrodite*, (Guillimard, 1978), trans. Richard M cDougall (The Harvester Press, 1980),vii.

¹² See Colapinto on the work of Milton Diamond in 1959 in Kansas and the three psychiatrists from Toronto, in *As Nature Made Him,: The Boy Who Was Raised as a Girl* (New York/London/Toronto/Sydney: Harper Perennial, 2000/2001), 44-46.

Dr. Money cared more for his theory of gender identity/role than he did about the facts; in other words, he was beginning to promote a mutated gender ideology.

A shift from academic professional audiences to broad public audiences occurred in 1972 when Dr. John Money published, through the Johns Hopkins Press, *Man and Woman Boy and Girl: The Differentiation and Dimorphism of Gender Identity from Conception to Maturity*, in which he proclaimed the ‘great success of his twins experiment’. Sprinkled through the book Money observes after describing his successes in gender identity-differentiation among human hermaphrodites, “A similar extraordinary contrast has been observed even which a child born as a normal male was surgically reassigned as a female...[I]n gender behavior, she is quite gender-different from her identical twin brother.”¹³

This new book of Money’s was praised on its cover by *The New York Times*: “The Brilliant New Landmark study of human sexuality... The most important work since the Kinsey Reports!”; *Time Magazine* soon followed. The conclusion most often repeated was that sex and gender identity was more due to environmental factors than to genes, anatomy, hormones and other natural factors from conception, birth, and puberty. Money himself “made the case the centerpiece of his public addresses, rarely giving a speech in which he did not mention it.”¹⁴

By 1975, Money continued to praise his own success in spite of clear contrary evidence from the Reimer family and especially Brenda. In Money’s words: “Dramatic proof that the

¹³ John Money & Anke A. Ehrhardt, *Man & Woman Boy & Girl: The Differentiation and Dimorphism of Gender Identity from Conception to Maturity* (New York and Scarborough, Ontario: New American Library Mentor Book, 1972).¹⁹ The text also refers the reader to further details in this case in Chapter 7 of the text)

¹⁴ Colapinto, *As Nature Made Him*, 71.

gender identity option is open at birth for normal infants and that social forces can intervene decisively at least up to a year and a half after birth comes from a few unusual cases such as one that occurred more than ten years ago.”¹⁵ And after the decision of the parents to bring up their son as a daughter, Money states: “The girl’s subsequent history proves how well all three of them succeeded in adjusting to that decision.”¹⁶

In this same year of 1975 Dr. Paul McHugh was appointed psychiatrist-in-chief at Johns Hopkins Hospital. Dr. McHugh requested a systematic study following up of children, especially males who had been transformed into females. Two of these studies of led him to conclude that “re-engineered males were almost never comfortable as females once they became aware of themselves and the world. From the start of their active play life, they behaved spontaneously like boys... and most of those individuals who learned that they were actually genetic males wished to reconstitute their lives as males... and all this despite the earnest efforts by their parents to treat them as girls.” He concluded that “we in the Johns Hopkins Psychiatry Department eventually concluded that human sexual identity is mostly built into our constitution by the genes we inherit and the embryogenesis we undergo.”¹⁷ At the final visit in 1978 at Johns Hopkins, Dr. Money introduced 13 year old Brenda to an adult transsexual, and Brenda fled his office, never to return again. In 1979 Dr. Paul McHugh closed down the gender identity clinic at Johns Hopkins Hospital and soon after moved Dr. Money’s office off campus and limited his teaching.

¹⁵ Money and Tucker, *Sexual Signatures*, 91. See also Colapinto, *As Nature Made Him*, chapter 5 and 6.

¹⁶ Money and Tucker, *Sexual Signatures*, 95.

¹⁷ Paul McHugh, “Surgical Sex” in *First Things* (November 2004): 1-6, here 4..

Through the encouragement of Dr. Mary McKenty, a Psychiatrist in Winnipeg, the parents of the twins were encouraged to tell their 15 year old sons the truth about what had happened so many years ago. In March 1980, as soon as Brenda learned the truth, she immediately made the decision to revert to the biological male sex of her birth, and to take the name of David. He felt relief because that truth explained why he had always felt an interior conflict about his identity. Dr. Paul McHugh stated unequivocally in his critique of Dr. Money's approach. "I have witnessed a great deal of damage from sex-reassignment. The children transformed from their male constitution into female roles suffered prolonged distress and misery as they sensed their natural attitudes. Their parents usually lived with guilt over their decisions—second guessing themselves and somewhat ashamed of the fabrication, both surgical and social, they had imposed on their sons."¹⁸ The harsh reality of human suffering for the Reimer family was not only evident in the parent's struggle with alcoholism and depression, but In 2002, Brian Reimer died from an overdose of medicine for his mental disease of schizophrenia; and in 2004 David Reimer died from shooting himself in the head after a time of despair.

Dr. John Money never corrected his public position about the gender window or gender gate which he continued to promote and to allow others to promote. He never even averted to the failure of his 'twins experiment.' In a publication as late as 1987, Money wrote about "A New Paradigm: Nature/Critical-Period/Nurture," which is needed to replace nature/nurture conflict.¹⁹

¹⁸ Paul McHugh, "Surgical Sex," 6.

¹⁹ John Money, "Propaedeutics of Diecious G-I/R", in *Masculinity/Femininity: Basic Perspectives* (New York:/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), 14.

In his typical Baconian attitude towards developing human beings, Money states: "Even nature is not inevitably immutable. The genes that govern heredity, the very epitome of nature, can be altered at a critical period by the intervention of nurture in the guise of gene splicing. The alteration then becomes permanent... Formulated in terms of reductionistic biology, nature is a political strategy of those committed to the status quo of sex differences."²⁰

Arguing from Artificial Division Gender-Identity/Role (G-I/R)

The second erroneous argument in John Money's theory about gender can be seen in his introduction in 1972 of Lockian definitions of: 'Gender Identity' as private and 'Gender Role' as public. In his words:

Gender Identity: The sameness, unity, and persistence of one's individuality as male, female, or ambivalent, in greater or lesser degree, especially as it is experienced in self-awareness and behavior; gender identity is the private experience of gender role, and gender role is the public expression of gender identity.

Gender Role: Everything that a person says and does, to indicate to others or to the self the degree that one is either male, or female, or ambivalent; it includes but is not restricted to sexual arousal and response' gender role is the public expression of gender identity, and gender identity is the private experience of gender role.²¹

In Chapter 8 of MWBG Money begins to tighten up the two phrases into one:... "gender identity" can be read to mean 'gender identity/role.'"²² In this context the terms 'masculinity' and

²⁰ Money, "Diecious G-I/R), 14.

²¹ Money, *Man&Woman*, 4 and 300-301.

²² Ibid., 153.

‘femininity’ are used to characterize proportions with a person who is more or less masculine or feminine in “vocational and domestic role” and “role as an erotic partner.”²³

Three years later in 1975 in *Sexual Signatures*, 5, Money repeats *verbatim* the two definitions above of gender identity and gender role, but this time after referring to gender identity forks that occur during the gender identity gate, he argues that a person “attained your gender identity/role in much the same way as you attained speech.”²⁴

Five years later, by 1980, in *Love and Love Sickness*, gender identity and gender role have now become an anagram, G-I/R. John Money makes a direct argument against the accusation that his slash between identity and role stands for a Cartesian type dualism:

G-I/R encompasses anything and everything that has to do with behavioral and psychologic differences between the sexes, no matter whether the differences are intrinsically or extraneously related to the genitalia...

It is erroneous to follow the example of some writers who juxtapose sex and gender, allocating sex to the body and what they call biology (as if there is no biology of the mind!) And gender to the mind and social learning, apparently unmindful of the biology of learning. In correct usage, gender is a more inclusive term than sex...²⁵

Yet, just three pages later, in Chapter 3: titled “Gender Identity/Role (G-I/R)”, Money describes the mind in Cartesian terms: “Herein lies the issue of solipsism. Oneself, alone, is privy to what goes on in one’s own mind. In the absence of its being overtly transmitted to other people

²³ Ibid., 153.

²⁴ Money, *Sexual Signatures*, 88.

²⁵ Money, *Love and Love sickness*, 12.

behaviorally, that is to say, either in words or in body language, the content of one's mind remains forever covert and unknown to others."²⁶

In an essay entitled: "Alternative Interpretations of the Development of G-I/R" Frank A. Beach raises an important question about Money's division between "the introspective component *gender identity* and his "defined *gender role* as a social script..."²⁷ Analyzing another article in which Money makes the same distinctions, Beach states: "Somewhere in the argument the distinction between gender role and gender identity gets lost. I understand that sociologists consider gender role as a script imposed on the individual by society. But what happens to gender identity? Is it relegated to Immanuel Kant's category of innate ideas?"²⁸

Money will try unsuccessfully to make erotic feelings the link between identity and role, as will be described and critiqued in our analysis of Money's fourth argument.

Arguing from Multiple Parts (sexes and genders) to the Whole

As early as 1955 John Money described "the sexuality of the individual [as] a cumulative composite of [six] separate sexes."²⁹ The six separate sexes were called: Chromosomal sex, Gonadal Sex, Physiological sex, Morphological sex, Behavioral sex, and Psychological sex

²⁶ Money, *Love and Love sickness*, 15

²⁷ Beach, "Alternative Interpretations of the Development of G-I/R", in *Masculinity and Femininity*, 29-36, 29.

²⁸ Beach, 30.

²⁹ J. Money, "Hermaphroditism, gender and precocity in hyperandrenocorticism: Psychological findings," *Bulletin of Johns Hopkins Hospital*, (2005) 96, 253-264. As summarized by David Crews, "Functional Associations in Behavioral Endocrinology," in Reinisch, et al, eds., *Masculinity/Femininity*, Chapter 6:83-105, here 91.

(gender-role/identity).³⁰ From the beginning of his research and publications, Dr. Money used these categories of separate sexes to compare humans with animals and normal humans with hermaphrodites.

In 1987, Dr. Money summarized and praised his earlier views with some additions:

In ordinary, healthy people, the multiple variables of sex, both male and female, correlate perfectly with one another, so that their potential independence of one another is not self-evident. This perfect correlation does not exist in syndromes of hermaphroditism....

In order of appearance, these variables were, as specified in 1955: chromosomal sex, gonadal sex, fetal hormonal sex, internal morphologic sex, and external morphologic sex. In postnatal life, the variables were, successively: assigned sex, sex of reading (including clinical habilitation), and pubertal hormonal sex. Together these variables were held responsible for the differentiation of gender role and orientation (identity) as male, female, or androgynous in the course of growing up. Since 1965, beginning with the 24th edition, *Dorland's Illustrated Medical Dictionary* has incorporated these variables into its definition of sex.³¹

In 1972, Money and Ehrhardt followed the same pattern and introduced sequential sub-
titles in the first chapter titled : Terminology and Nature of Hermaphroditism; Chromosomal and Gonadal Sex; Gonadal, Hormonal, and Morphologic Sex; and Fetal Hormonal Sex, the Nervous System, and Behavior; External Morphologic Sex and Assigned Sex; and Differentiation of Gender Identity; Gender Identity and Pubertal Hormones.³² By 1975 Money introduced the concept of 'forks' in the road, which were detours selected by an unborn individual, in the space

³⁰ Crews, "Functional Associations", Table 6-2, 91.

³¹ Money "Propaedeutics of Diecious G-I/R", 16.

³² Money and Ehrhardt, *Man & Woman*, Chapter 1, 6-25. In subsequent chapters further categories included internal genital, external genital, brain dimorphism, and gender dimorphic traditions; 41, 44, 95, 248-49, and 130ff.

and time between some of the earlier named sexes: chromosomal sex, gonadal sex, and external genitals, before the letter 'm' or 'f' are put on his or her birth certificate.³³

In his summary of "Multivariate Sequential Determinism" Money argues that the "adult status of gender-identity/role (G-I/R) is the culmination of a sequential and multivariate process...". The question that a philosopher must ask is: "What guides this sequential and multivariate process?" In other words, how can an unborn human being, as a collection of different sexes, take a detour or fork when there is no organizing principle within the being? Money has no principle comparable to a substantial form which actualizes potentialities within the developing fetus.

Another clue to Money's goals in these discussions about different sexes within the human being comes from his fascination with lower forms animals and fish. In his 1987 article on "Propaedeutics of Diecious G-I/R", Money introduces the theme of "diecious fishes", or fish who sometimes breed as males and other times as female. Then Dr. Money draws his conclusions from lower forms of life for humans:

Once science uncovers the secret of hermaphroditic versatility of sex-changing fish and parthenogenetic lizards, then on the criterion that today's science fiction becomes tomorrow's science, it will undoubtedly be applied to mammals. Thus, one can envisage a future when sex-irreducible G-I/R will no longer be fixed and irreducible, but, by a process equivalent to reverse embryogenesis, it will be sex reversible.³⁴

³³ See Money and Tucker, *Sexual Signatures*, 48-49.

³⁴ Money, "Propaedeutics of Diecious G-I/R", 18-19. See Frank Beach's argument that Money's theory about the dimorphic brain schemata present in both males and females implies an erroneous leap from the general to the particular, "because his list includes both human and animal behavior...in several cases [where] no such implication appears justified.", "Alternative Interpretations of G-I/R", 33.

26-1-28
 Joined to this postulation of sex reversible human beings, Dr. Money suggests that the human brain holds both male and female in it. "The two gender schemata, male and female, exist compatibly in the brains of most people, one dominant over the other, their dual presence scarcely recognized."³⁵ After discussing some examples which fall outside of the norm, he concludes that in many people the two gender schemas "are now officially classified as topological distinctions, analogous to left-handedness and ambidextrousness."³⁶

Two different researchers have critiqued the practice of drawing conclusions from animals to humans, as Dr. Money tends to do. The first was Robert J. Stoller, a psychiatrist, who had established a gender identity clinic at the UCLA School of Medicine shortly after Johns Hopkins had established theirs in the late 1950's to early 1960's. Dr. Stoller stated in a 1968 text titled *Sex and Gender: The Development of Masculinity and Femininity*, "We must be careful: Extrapolation from lower animals to humans is exhilarating but dangerous. The mechanisms involved are often too complex to permit this."³⁷ The second critique of the same false move came in 1987, from Frank Beach, Department of Psychology, University of California, Berkeley. In a direct critique of Money's arguments, Beach stated: "Because [Money's list of nine sex-shared threshold-dimorphic types of behavior] includes both human and animal behavior, he seems to imply shared mechanisms, but in several cases no such implication appears"

Just mention!

³⁵ Money, *Propaedeutics of Diecious G-I/R*", 24.

³⁶ Money, *Propaedeutics of Diecious G-I/R*", 25.

³⁷ Robert J. Stoller, M.D., *Sex and Gender: Volume II The Development of Masculinity and Femininity* (New York: Jason Aronson, 1968), 8.

justified./...As we all know, outwardly similar patterns of behavior in different species can have quite different developmental histories and be mediated by quite dissimilar mechanisms.”³⁸

Proactive Eroticism of Human Relations

The final area of difficulty in Dr. John Money's work on gender identity concerns the continuous promotion of erotic sexual experience, from the beginning of his work to the end of it.. One of the books from ~~our~~ ^{& Thomas} seminary library ^{which was pre-mediated SJV} which Dr. Money had co-edited on behalf of the American Psychopathological Association, Contemporary Sexual Behavior: critical issues in the 1970's, includes his presentation to the 1970-1971 annual conference, entitled “Pornography in the Home: A Topic in Medical Education.” Dr. Money showed explicitly pornographic images to the audience and argued forcefully for the so-called value of sharing of this kind of imagery in schools and homes “into the total context of sex education.”³⁹ Dr. Money's approach to pornography is clearly stated in this professional essay. He argues that exposure to pornographic images, even at a young age, is valuable because they “lead to the possibility of bettering one's own sex life, leading one to have less guilt and fewer ‘hang-ups’, and more honesty and freedom about sex”; “one becomes better able to help others by achieving a position...of non judgmentalism;” and “satiation effect,...the half-life of pornography...is from about two to four hours out of your total lifetime. So... perhaps you better make sure you'll enjoy it tonight!”⁴⁰

³⁸ Frank A. Beach, “Alternative Interpretations of the Development of G-I/R,” 34.

³⁹ Money, “Pornography in the Home,” in Zubin and Money, *Contemporary Sexual Behavior*, 409-440, here, 410.

⁴⁰ Money, “Pornography in the home,” 418-19. October 25, 2012. For a more detailed description of his interactions with the Reimer twins about this theme, see Colapinto, *As Nature*

Dr. Money connected his promotion of childhood exposure to pornography and sex acts to a study of animals. "The chief source of empirical data on juvenile erotosexual rehearsal play is the Wisconsin Regional Primate Center where juvenile rhesus monkeys have been studied."⁴¹ Drawing his implications from this study where both female and male monkeys deprived of sex play in early life proved unable to mate in later life, Money concluded that "It may well play an extremely influential role as a critical-period phenomenon wherein nature and nurture merge to establish future erotosexual health, male and female."⁴² The arguments above by Frank Beach can also apply as well to this use of animals for complex human interactions. I would add that the dimension of spirit in the human soul provides a completely different capacity for expressions of love than are found in mating among animals.

Money's praise for pornography was also paired with his attack on the Catholic Church—a pattern that repeats itself over and over again. In this essay, his example is called "an allegory of the Crucifixion". He argues that even though millions of children for two-thousand years have learned at Church on Sunday's about 'how to commit a crucifixion', and adds that he has "not heard of children who come home and play crucifixion games with their dolls or playmates." Money concludes: "Pornography does not automatically have the power to incite

Made Him, 86ff. Money also drew upon some hypotheses (which turned out later to be false) about the value of "sexual rehearsal play" among Australian aborigines, the Yolngu., 88 ff.

⁴¹ Money, "Propaedeutics of Diecious G-I/R", 26.

⁴² Money, "Propaedeutics of Diecious G-I/R", 26.

behavior.”⁴³ It is clear that Dr. Money does not understand the difference between spirit and the human capacity to love and either human passions or an animal’s mating behavior.

As mentioned previously, in the late 1960's Dr. Money asked the Reimers to do everything they could to bring one of their identical male twins up as a girl and the other as a boy. During annual visits bringing the children to Money’s clinic, he encouraged sexual play even to the point of suggesting that the mother walk around nude at home and that they parents allow their children to observe them having sexual intercourse. The parents refused to comply to this suggestion. The twins, during a later interview by John Colapinto said that Dr. Money “would show us pictures of kinds—boys and girls— with no clothes on....; and also showed them pictures of adults engaged in sexual intercourse He’d say to us, I want to show you pictures of things that moms and dads do.”⁴⁴

In 1979, after the Reimer family had ended their annual trips to Baltimore for their son, Dr. Money came to Winnipeg to give two lectures at the Health Sciences Center. He contrived to stay overnight at the home of the Reimer family, much to their discomfort; and both of the twins, now 14 years old avoided him as much as possible. The family only learned later that the lectures Dr. Money had given at the university were on pornography with his usual slides and videos even encouraging incest and group sex.⁴⁵

⁴³ Money, “Pornography in the home,” in Zubin and Money, eds., *Contemporary Sexual Behavior: Critical Issues in the 1970's* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973), 409-440, here 417.

⁴⁴ Colapinto, *As Nature Made Him*, 86.

⁴⁵ Colapinto, *As Nature Made Him*, 153-157.

At the same time, the BBC had discovered where the Reimer twins lived and went to school and was secretly filming for a program called “Open Secret” on medical scandals. Even though Dr. Money and the general public continued to herald Dr. Money’s ‘twins experiment’, Dr. Diamond had published serious doubts about ‘the twin’ case in two journals; he “never deviated from his conviction that sex reassignment of a developmentally normal infant was impossible.”⁴⁶ After the BBC’s report in 1979, Dr. Money just went silent on the Reimer case, but as we will see in the next section, it had become part of a ‘gender ideology’ which had its own trajectory.

The important thing to note in this description of the roots of gender ideology in the work of Dr. John Money, that he forges a solid link between the more general theme of a woman or man’s gender identity qua woman or man and erotic sexual experience and orientation. This approach was publically promoted for pedophilia.⁴⁷ In *Sexual Signatures* (1975) Money argues again that it is good to encourage children to observe sexual intercourse of adults, and that “the best time to introduce such pictures [The Pictorial Guide to Sexual Intercourse, by Schwenda and Leuchner, 1969] is before a child’s biological clock has signaled the start of puberty.”⁴⁸ He further argues against the “incest taboo.”⁴⁹ Finally, in this same text, Money promotes the

⁴⁶ Colapino, *As Nature Made Him*, 45ff, 166 ff, 174ff

⁴⁷ John Money, “Interview in *Paidika: The Journal of Paedophilia* (Spring 1991), vol 2. no. 3, p. 5 as reported in Wikipedia, ‘On pedophilia,’ available at http://wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Money [accessed 12/22/2011].

⁴⁸ John Money and Patricia Tucker, *Sexual Signatures: On Being a Man or a Woman* (Boston-Toronto: Little Brown and Company, 1975), 134.

⁴⁹ Money, *Sexual Signatures*, 182.

possibility that “all humans are capable of developing a bisexual gender identity/role... and giving it an erotic expression,...”⁵⁰

His fascination with multiple varied aspect of the erotic takes over more and more of his writings over time. By 1980, in *Love and Love Sickness: The Science of Sex, Gender Difference, and Pair-bonding*, Money introduces a new field called: ‘sexophy.’, defined as: “the body of knowledge that comprises the philosophy, principles, and knowledge that people have about their own personally experienced erotic sexuality and that of other people, singly, and collectively.”⁵¹ Chapter 4 of the text is entirely on this topic. It begins with another Cartesian-like mental description: “Sexosophy is a new term, coined to fill a lexicographical gap and provide the word we all need to refer to the principles and knowledge people have about their own personal experience of sexual erotic functioning within themselves.”⁵² The very next section is a distorted attack, once again on Religion: titled “Original Innocence, Original Sin”, written just one year after Pope John Paul II began his first audience on the Theology of the Body with the same words but very different meanings.⁵³ Money argues that the culture ‘despoils’ our birthright, treats ‘sex

⁵⁰ Money, *Sexual Signatures*, 207.

⁵¹ Money, *Love and Love Sickness*, Glossary 223.

⁵² Money, *Love and Love Sickness*, Chapter 4: 43-72, here 43.

⁵³ See John Paul II’s audience of September 26, 1979 (The Boundary between Original Innocence and Redemption) in which he argues that Christ appeals to an original state of man and woman before original sin., See John Paul II, *Man and Woman: He Created Them: Theology of the Body*, (Boston: Pauline Books and Media, 2006), 142-149.

as wicked' especially in childhood, and severely limits the possibility of gathering empirical evidence on "erotic sexualism as subjectively experienced and reported in childhood."⁵⁴

By the time Dr. Money wrote his "Propaedeutics of Diecious G-I/R" in the 1987 Kinsey Institute Series on *Masculinity and Femininity*, he had completely integrated his erotic interests in the definition of Gender-Identity/Role. In his words: "Erotosexually, a G-I/R may be heterosexual, bisexual (androgynous), or homosexual, or it may be transsexual or transvestic."⁵⁵ In this description, Money has identified five genders, an example of a key phase in the 'expansion' of gender ideology.

5 categories

Summary: Characteristics of the Root of Gender Ideology

In this summary of the research and arguments of Dr. John Money, I have tried to show how the introduction of the word 'gender' came out of the cooperative work of anthropologists and psychologists and quickly embedded itself in the respected Johns Hopkins Medical School with the opening of a Gender Identity Clinic. Money's writings about a gender gate or gender window during the first two years of life, and his general approach to gender identity/role were shown to have several philosophical errors, based on the relation of exceptions to the rule, multiple parts to wholes, division of identity and role, and a hyper eroticization of relationships among adults and children and men and women.

sum

Intubated Ideology
virus →
ignores facts vs theory
has been innocent

⁵⁴ Money, *Love and Love Sickness*, 43-44.

⁵⁵ Money, *Propaedeutics of Diecious G-I/R*, 17-18.

Dr. Money's point
Analogous error
in science when
science is just beginning

Money's many
errors in 80's
science - they
of sex science
just beginning

sum

It was also shown that Dr. Money avoided facts and counter-examples to his claim of success in the 'twin experiment' of changing a normal male child into an identity as a female. By ignoring gender reality, Dr. Money made it clear that he was promoting a gender ideology. Subsequently, it became clear as well that this gender ideology harms the innocent. In this case the innocent were children. By analogy It can be argued that a 'sex ideology' that was perpetuated post-Aristotle, that the female was by nature passive and unable to produce fertile seed (ovulation) for conception also harmed the innocent during its nearly 2000 years of continuation. In this case the innocent were women.⁵⁶

Returning to Gender Ideology, I will also add that it may very well have harmed innocent seminarians and priests who read Money's books. To my great surprise, when I asked our librarians at St. John Vianney Theological Seminary for Inter-Library Loan of four of Dr. Money's books [*Contemporary Sexual Behavior*, *Man&Woman Boy&Girl/Sexual Signatures*, and *Love and Love Sickness*] by Dr. Money, I found out that they were already in the original St. Thomas Library, which was supposedly a library of philosophy and theology texts, bought at the time of publication in the early 1970's.

The Feminization and Politicalization of Gender: Gender Ideology 'Goes Viral'

Analogous to the way a virus mutates and spreads, in the 1970's and beyond Gender Ideology found for itself willing hosts. "Max Delbruck... described the basic 'life cycle' of a virus in 1937: rather than 'growing', a virus particle is assembled from its constituent pieces in

⁵⁶ See Sr. Prudence Allen, RSM, *The Concept of Woman* Vols I and II.

one step; eventually it leaves the host cell to infect other cells.”⁵⁷ Furthermore, an introduction to viruses states that “most virus infections eventually result in the death of the host cell...(cell ‘suicide’)...; and often cell death is caused by cessation of its normal activity...”⁵⁸

In this section of the paper on the conflict between Gender Reality and Gender Ideology the ways in which gender ideology ‘went viral’ will be described.

Feminisms Adopt the Word ‘Gender’

In 1970, in chapter two of her book *Sexual Politics* Kate Millett (1934-) introduced the term ‘gender’ and its use first by Robert Stoller with respect to establishing a core gender identity by the age of eighteen months.⁵⁹ Chapter two of this text was drawn from her PhD dissertation on the same topic awarded by Columbia University in 1970. Dr. Millett referred to the California Gender Identity Clinic and some of the studies being done on gender identity there, and she repeats the following distinction of Stoller’s: “Gender is a term that has psychological or cultural rather than biological connotations. If the proper terms for sex are ‘male’ and ‘female,’ the corresponding terms for gender are ‘masculine’ and ‘feminine’; these latter may be quite independent of (biological) sex.”⁶⁰ In her very next sentence Millett begins “Indeed, so arbitrary

⁵⁷ Virology, Available from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Virology> [accessed 2/6/2012], 1 of 3.

⁵⁸ Introduction to viruses, Available from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Introduction_to_viruses [accessed 2/6/12], 1 of 1.

⁵⁹ Kate Millett, *Sexual Politics* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1970), 29.

⁶⁰ Millett, *Sexual Politics*, 30, referring back to Robert J. Stoller, *Sex and Gender* (New York: Science House, 1968, 9.

is gender, that it may even be contrary to physiology;”⁶¹ Millett then directly quotes Stoller, who this time includes reference himself to Dr. John Money”...although the external genitalia (penis, testes, scrotum) contribute to the sense of maleness, no one of them is essential for it, not [sic. nor] even all of them together. In the absence of complete evidence, I agree in general with Money, and the Hampsons, who show in their large series of intersexed patients that gender role is determined by postnatal [sic. psychological] forces, regardless of the anatomy and physiology of the external genitalia.”⁶² Millett then directly quotes John Money approving his view: “...the condition existing at birth and for several months thereafter is one of psychosexual undifferentiation.”⁶³

Kate Millett then draws her own feminist evaluation from Money and Stoller’s descriptions of gender as socially conditioned. From early on children are conditioned, she argues. “To take a simple example: expectations the culture cherishes about his gender identity encourage the young male to develop aggressive impulses, and the female to thwart her own and turn them inward. The result is that the male tends to have aggression reinforced in his behavior... The same process of reinforcement is evident in producing the chief ‘feminine virtue

⁶¹ Millett, *Sexual Politics*, 30.

⁶² Millett, *Sexual Politics*, 30, referring back to Stoller, *Sex and Gender*, 48, who in turn refers back to J. Money, J.G. Hampson, and J.L. Hampson (1955). “An Examination ... of Human Hermaphroditism” and J. Money, J. G. Hampson, and J. L. Hampson (1957). “Imprinting and ... Gender Role.

⁶³ Millett, *Sexual Politics*, 30, referring to John Money, “Psychosexual Differentiation,” in *Sex Research, New Developments* (New York: Holt, 1965), 12.

of passivity.” In contemporary terminology, the basic division of temperamental trait is marshaled along the line of ‘aggression is male’ and ‘passivity is female’”⁶⁴

Millett’s book continues to analyze what she identifies as the evils of patriarchy in political, polemical, and literary works and events, divided into two historical periods: 1830-1930 and 1930-1960. In 1966 Kate Millett became a member of the National Organization of Women (NOW), shortly after it was founded.

Another early feminist connection with Dr. Money occurred through Dr. Alice Rossi (1922-2009), who was a founding member of NOW in 1966.⁶⁵ In 1967 Rossi joined the faculty at Johns Hopkins University and in 1969-1974 at Goucher College, both located in Baltimore. It was during this seminal time that in 1970-71 Dr. John Money was “largely responsible for ...a symposium,” of the American Psychopathological Association, which brought together scholars from the interdisciplinary fields of medicine, psychology, and sociology.⁶⁶ This conference included in addition to the feminist sociologist Alice Rossi, the gynecologist William H. Masters, and the psychologists Virginia E. Johnson, John Money and Saul Rosenzweig. The proceedings

⁶⁴ Millett, *Sexual Politics*, 31-32.

⁶⁵ A step in the rapid spread of gender ideology is found in the collaborative work of Dr. Money; with the previously well-established field of sexology as represented by the Kinsey reports (*Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (1948) and *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female* (1953) and subsequent reports of Masters and Johnson (*Human Sexual Response* (1966) and *Human Sexual Inadequacy* (1970)). All of these elements were in place at the 61st annual American Psychopathological Association Conference sponsored by Johns Hopkins University Medical School in Baltimore in 1970. Dr. Alice Rossi, a moderate feminist, was a participant in this same conference. In 1959 Rossi had been hired to teach full time in Sociology at the University of Chicago.

⁶⁶ The Symposium was of the 61st annual American Psychopathological Association. Zubin and Money were listed as the ‘Committee on Program and the editors of its proceedings published by The Johns Hopkins University Press as *Contemporary Sexual Behavior*, xv.

of this conference, *Contemporary Sexual Behavior: Critical Issues in the 1970's* published in Baltimore and London in 1973 by Johns Hopkins University Press, lent credibility to the conference and its authors' work. John Money was one of the two editors of the book. The theme of pornography was also front and center in the proceedings at the same time as Money's gender theory gained prominence.⁶⁷ This conference provided a public space for the cross-fertilization of discussions about gender identity, various forms of sex activity, and sex roles. In sort, it provided a complex space for new willing hosts to accept 'gender ideology.'

In the proceedings of the conference in the references to her Chapter on "Maternalism, Sexuality, and the New Feminism," Dr. Rossi cited John Money's research on gender six separate times. In the chapter itself, she states: "With some hesitation, I now plan to attempt a rather wide-ranging extrapolation from the rigorous research of Anke Ehrhardt and John Money (1967; Ehrhardt et al. 1968a,b; Money et al. 1968), by proposing a direction someone will hopefully take from the results of their research on fetal hormone balance impact on subsequent personality and social behavior."⁶⁸ Rossi was most interested in how the hormonal balance affected different kinds of variations within a particular sex, in this case female, rather than on 'the diagnosis and treatment of abnormality.' She wondered whether the qualities of "high physical energy and psychological toughness... could be triggered by a more-than-usual hormonal balance tipped to androgen excess outside the modal range of female variation?"⁶⁹ Significantly,

⁶⁷ See Money's earlier mentioned paper arguing for introducing pornography in the home and in sex education, *Contemporary Sexual Behavior*, 409-440.

⁶⁸ Alice Rossi, "Maternalism, Sexuality, and the New Feminism," in *Contemporary Sexual Behavior*, chapter 8: 145-173, here 152.

⁶⁹ Rossi, "Maternalism", 155.

in this early text Alice Rossi does not use the word 'gender' in her chapter, but limited herself to the word 'sex' when referring to woman's identity. Alice Rossi's seminal work, *The Feminist Papers: From Adams to de Beauvoir*, was published in 1973, when many universities were beginning courses in women's studies and feminist studies. Alice Rossi also gave attention early on to abortion rights for women.⁷⁰

Ten years later Dr. Rossi gave new prominence to the word 'gender', when in her 1983 Presidential Address to the American Sociological Association, she titles her text "Gender and Parenthood."⁷¹ Significantly, Alice Rossi adopts the 'word' gender without the ideological meaning (of total social construction) that had been given to it by Money and other theorists. For Rossi and many moderate feminists, gender simply became the commonly used word to describe a woman or a man's identity, including a foundation in biological sex as female or male. In this she affirmed what I will call 'gender reality.' In Rossi's words: "Genes, organisms and environment interpenetrate and mutually determine each other."⁷²

In 1983 Alice Rossi attempted to bring a reasonable balance back into the meaning and use of the word 'gender', which had begun to become captured by various ideologies: "Gender differentiation is *not* simply a function of socialization, capitalist production, or patriarchy. It is

⁷⁰ In the conference proceedings Saul Rosenzweig's supported early detection of fetal sex and simple abortion so that "parental choice of neonate sex would become fairly simple", *Contemporary Sexual Behavior*, 202. Rossi also wrote: "Feminists of all political stripes have been united in their insistence on the right of women to control their own bodies, have been sharply critical of masculine assumptions concerning female sexuality, and, hence, have demanded safe contraceptives and abortion repeal...", 155.

⁷¹ Alice S. Rossi, "Gender and Parenthood," 1983 Presidential Address, *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 49 (February 1984): 1-19.

⁷² Rossi, "Gender and Parenthood," 11.

grounded in a sex dimorphism that serves the fundamental purpose of reproducing the species.”⁷³

I agree with Rossi’s statement of the importance of the male-female sexual differentiation, as the root ground or foundation for gender. Simply stated: the gender of woman is rooted in her female sex and the gender of man is rooted in his male sex always or for the most part. This leaves room for the occasional natural exception without changing the essential meaning of gender differentiation.

next
step

In addition to academic lectures and political action, feminists also produced text books using Money’s descriptions about gender identity/role; and these provided hosts for gender ideology that spread through out universities across America, Canada, England, Australia, and the English-speaking world. The first example of a textbook is *Gender: An Ethnomethodological Approach* was published in 1978 in the four countries of England, Australia, Canada, and the United States. In the preface its two authors Suzanne Kessler and Wendy McKenna state “Our theoretical position is that gender is a social construction, that a world of two ‘sexes’ is a result of the socially shared, taken-for granted methods which members use to construct reality. This position is grounded in the ethnomethodological perspective...which asserts that the ‘irreducible facts’ in which members of a group believe are given their sense of objectivity through the course of social interaction.”⁷⁴

This textbook cites seven different sources authored by John Money; and it incorporates

⁷³ Rossi, “Gender and Parenthood,” 11.

⁷⁴ Suzanne J. Kessler and Wendy McKenna, *Gender: An Ethnomethodological Approach* (New York. Chichester. Brisbane. Toronto: John Wiley & Sons, 1978), vii.

nearly verbatim many of Money's definitions. In just one example: "Gender identity refers to an individual's own ^{feel} feeling of whether she or he is a woman or a man, or a girl or a boy, In essence gender identity is self-attribution of gender."⁷⁵ In addition, even when the authors question some of Money's claims, they transmit his views about the critical period when gender identity/role is flexible. It also transmits the six 'sexes' identified by Dr. Money, but now calls them: "Biologists' Criteria for Determining Gender; Chromosomes, Gonads, Internal reproductive organs, prenatal hormones, External reproductive organs, Pubertal hormones."⁷⁶ Finally, the text repeats all the various arguments from cross cultural studies and from animal studies to humans.

The second example of a popular textbook, *The Question of Sex Differences: Psychological, Cultural, and Biological Issues* was published in the US and Canada the following year, 1979, authored by Katharine Hoyenga and Kermit Hoyenga. Even though the title emphasizes Sex, the content completely adopts Money's use of terms and definitions:

Gender identity: The sameness, unity and persistence of one's individuality as male or female (or ambivalent) in greater or less degree, especially as it is experienced in self-awareness and behavior.

Gender role: Everything that a person says and does, to indicate to others or to the self the degree to which one is male or female or ambivalent ...Gender role is the public expression of gender identity, and gender identity is the private experience of gender role.⁷⁷

⁷⁵ Kessler and McKenna, *Gender*, 8.

⁷⁶ Kessler and McKenna, *Gender*, 64.

⁷⁷ Katharine Blick Hoyenga and Kermit T. Hoyenga, *The Question of Sex Differences: Psychological, Cultural, and Biological Issues* (Boston and Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, 1979), 4, referring back to Money and Ehrhardt, *Man & Woman*.

The Hoyengas changed Dr. Money's list of sexes and genders to a list completely of genders in a chart titled: "Eight Definitions of Gender: Chromosomal Gender, Gonadal Gender, Hormonal Gender, Gender of the Internal Sexual Accessory Organs, Gender of External Genitals, Gender of Rearing, Gender Identity, [and] Gender Role."⁷⁸ The word 'Gender' has now become transformed into the major category including sex.

To complete this section on how the word 'gender' begins to spread broadly among academic feminists in English-speaking countries, the time line for switching from the word 'sex' to the word 'gender' will be briefly traced in the publications of Alison Jaggar, who was born in England, studied at the University of London, University of Edinburgh, received her PhD University of Buffalo in 1970, and is presently Full Professor with a joint appointment at the University of Colorado Boulder in Philosophy and Gender Studies.

In 1974, Dr. Jaggar first wrote a pathbreaking article entitled "On Sex Equality," which did not include any reference to gender. In a major philosophical anthology *Feminism and Philosophy* (1977), which includes a section entitled "Sex Roles and Gender," and article by Elizabeth L. Beardsley entitled "Traits and Genderization, Jaggar's, "Political Philosophies of Women's Liberation, (a revision of a paper written in 1972) never introduces the word 'gender', but refers only to sex, sex roles, sexuality, and so forth. Then in 1983 Alison Jaggar introduced the concept of gender in an article entitled "Human Biology in Feminist Theory: Sexual Equality Reconsidered"; and in 1990 Dr. Jaggar co edited with Susan Bordo *Gender/Body/Knowledge*:

⁷⁸ Hoyenga and Hoyenga, *Sex Differences*, 5.

Feminist Reconstructions of Being and Knowing.⁷⁹ Jaggar exemplifies the way that philosophers followed behind academics in the social sciences in adopting and using the word 'gender' in their professional work. The academics discussed in this section were moderate feminists who laid the ground-work for gender ideology to "go viral". In the next section, the word 'gender' gets infused with more radical meaning which added to its virulence.

The Sex/Gender System Collapses in on Itself

The sex/gender system is rendered incoherent along two different pathways which at times cross over into one another, at other times merge, and other times separate. The pathways can be distinguished in general as follows:

First pathway of collapse: Following a Cartesian mentality, sex is limited to bodily characteristics and gender is limited to social psychological characteristics felt in the mind. This division between mind and body is symbolized by a forward slash as in sex/gender. Over time the 'category' of gender is broadened to include various kinds of sexual activity and medically transgendered human beings. Once this happens, the body enters into gender through the back door, and we begin to get the original two genders, expanded to five, ten, or fifteen including variously examples as intersex bisexuals (male or female), homosexuals (male or female),

⁷⁹ Alison Jaggar, "On Sex Equality," *Ethics*, 84.4 (July 1974):275-291; and "Human Biology in Feminist Theory: Sexual Equality Reconsidered," in *Beyond Domination: New Perspectives on Women and Philosophy*, ed. Carol C. Gould (New Jersey: Rowan and Allanheld, 1983) 21-24; and Alison M. Jaggar and Susan Bordo, *Gender/Body/Knowledge: Feminist Reconstructions of Being and Knowing* (New Brunswick and London: Rutgers University Press, 1989).

heterosexuals (male or female), transgendered males, transgendered females and so on. So the original separation of bodily sex from gendered identity collapses in on itself.

The second pathway of collapse: Following a post modern or nominalist approach to words and categories, both sex and gender differentiation little by little disappear into the sexless and genderless human, which in turn itself disappears. The identity of the person evaporates and what is left is simply unites of pleasure or pain.

To demonstrate these two ways of collapsing the sex/gender system or distinctions some of the main philosophers who follow this path are briefly described below.

Gayle Rubin (1949-), after completing her MA in Anthropology at the University of Michigan, introduced the phrase 'sex/gender system' in her 1975 article "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex.". Following a Marxist approach, she defined the phrase: I "... call that part of social life the 'sex/gender system' [which] is the set of arrangements by which a society transforms biological sexuality into products of human activity, and in which these transformed sexual needs are satisfied."⁸⁰ Arguing that men traffic in women to satisfy their sexual needs, Rubin argued: "Gender is a socially imposed division of the sexes [into men and women]. It is a product of the social relations of sexuality"⁸¹

Her solution to the so-called division of sexes is to political action to reorganize the sex/gender system towards "the elimination of obligatory sexualities and sex roles. The dream I find most compelling is one of an androgynous and genderless (though not sexless) society, in

⁸⁰ Gayle Rubin, "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex," in Rayna R. Reiter, *Monthly Review Press* (1995): 157-212, here 159.

⁸¹ Rubin, "Traffic in Women," 179.

which one's sexual anatomy is irrelevant to who one is, what one does, and with whom one makes love."⁸² Although Rubin appeared to lean at first more towards a Marxist political interpretation of gender, by 1978 she turned her own life and research towards sado-maschism in a study of and living with gay men and lesbian women in San Francisco. Gayle Rubin completed her PhD in Anthropology for the University of Michigan in 1994 with her doctoral dissertation titled: The Valley of the Kings: Leathermen in San Francisco 1960-1990.

Dr. Rubin is presently teaching a course on Foucault in her position as Associate Professor of Comparative Literature and Assistant Professor of Anthropology and Women Studies at the University of Michigan. Our analysis will return briefly to consider Foucault's relation to gender ideology. In The History of Sexuality Foucault argued that "sex...[is] an imaginary point determined by the deployment of sexuality."⁸³ Sexuality ought to displace sex in any analysis of this aspect of human life. He argued further that sex was completely a social construct, and that the 'anchorage points' of "the body, anatomy, the biological, and the functional" should be eliminated in favor of "sexuality."⁸⁴ In Foucault's deconstructionist approach, the metaphysical foundation of the human being as composite substance or *hylomorphic* union of soul/body is jettisoned for a floating 'I think' or 'I feel'.

The same year that Gayle Rubin introduced the theme of a sex/gender system, "[i]n the spring of 1975 he [the French **philosopher Michel Foucault 1926-1984**)] plunged passionately

⁸² Rubin, "Traffic in Women," 204.

⁸³ Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, Volume I: An Introduction (New York: Vintage Books, 1980, 152.

⁸⁴ Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, 156.

into San Francisco's gay community, attracted especially by the consensual sado-masochistic eroticism that flourished in a number of bathhouses in the Bay City at that time... Foucault now searched for the 'complete total pleasure,' the 'limit experience' that he associated with death... In fall 1983 Foucault made what would be his final trip to San Francisco... now preoccupied by AIDS and by his own possible death from the deadly disease."⁸⁵ In his *History of Sexuality*, he argued that sex is an illusion, while at the same time he choose to seek purpose or intelligibility of his own identity in its multiple acts. Foucault 'prophetically' predicted his own way of death:

The Faustian pact, whose temptation has been instilled in us by the deployment of sexuality, is now as follows: to exchange life in its entirety for sex itself, for the truth and the sovereignty of sex. Sex is worth dying for. It is in this (strictly historical) sense that sex is indeed imbued with the death instinct. When a long while ago the West discovered love, it bestowed on it a value high enough to make death acceptable; nowadays it is sex that claims this equivalence, the highest of all. And while the deployment of sexuality permits the techniques of power to invest life, the fictitious point of sex, itself marked by that deployment, exerts enough charm on everyone for them to accept hearing the grumble of death within it.⁸⁶

Since Foucault opened this way of analysis, many feminist writers have applied and developed his theories in relation to contemporary issues about gender. Teresa de Lauretis, in her 1987 text *Technologies of Gender*, claims that gender is the effect produced in bodies by complex political technology which produces technologies of sex, technologies of gender, and socially constructed engendered beings. An expansion of her view is as follows:

⁸⁵ Grenz, *A Primer on Postmodernism*, 125-26. Grenz refers his reader to the more detailed account of these events in James Miller, *The Passion of Michel Foucault* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1993), 27-29 and 253.

⁸⁶ Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, 156. Grenz, in *A Primer on Postmodernism*, summarizes the sex-acts that Foucault was choosing to undertake at the very same time as he was writing his *History of Sexuality*, 253.

The construction of gender goes on today through the various technologies of gender (e.g. cinema) and institutional discourses (e.g. theory) with power to control the field of social meaning and thus produce, promote, and 'implant' representations of gender. But the terms of a different construction of gender also exist, in the margins of hegemonic discourses. Posed from outside the heterosexual social contract, and inscribed in micropolitical practices, these terms can also have a part in the construction of gender, and their effects are rather at the 'local' level of resistances, in subjectivity and self-representation.⁸⁷

de Lauretis analyzes the various ways in which gender is a product and process of representation, a construction that continues to effect women and men by forming them into concrete individuals. She demonstrates further the ways in which "the construction of gender is also affected by its deconstruction."⁸⁸ de Lauretis concludes with only a partial deconstruction of gender:

We cannot resolve or dispel the uncomfortable condition of being at once inside and outside gender either by desexualizing it (making gender merely a metaphor, a question of *différence*, of purely discursive effects) or by androgynizing it (claiming the same experience of material conditions for both genders in a given class, race, or culture).⁸⁹

In 1988 Biddy Martin takes a further step in developing contemporary consequences of Foucault's social construct argument when she states that:

For Foucault, the question of the truth of one's sex, of one's self is not a self-evident question, and the answers which literature, medicine, psychiatry and religion provide are, in fact, a matter of rendering our bodies and psyches subject

⁸⁷ Teresa de Lauretis, *Technologies of Gender* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana U. Press, 1987), 18. de Lauretis directly mentions her indebtedness to Foucault: "The essay takes its title and its conceptual premise from Foucault's theory of sexuality as a 'technology of sex' and proposes that gender, too, both as representation and as self representation, is the product of various social technologies, such as cinema, as well as institutional discourses, epistemologies, and critical practices.", ix.

⁸⁸ de Lauretis, *Technologies of Gender*, 3.

⁸⁹ de Lauretis, *Technologies of Gender*, 11.

to control. Having created sex and gender as problems of a particular kind, the experts must necessarily intervene in our lives to provide solutions and to bind us within a particular identity, a subjectivity. Woman, as a category of meaning, and women have been subject to the gaze, the interventions, and the control of medical, psychoanalytic, and aesthetic experts who do the work of limiting and regulating what it means to be a woman in line with the exigencies of their own discursive fields and legitimating truths.⁹⁰

Martin considers what she perceives as a difficulty of modern feminists, or how to "desexualize the category of woman" at the same time as woman is kept as a starting point for critical reflection on oppressive structures of society. She sees this as the paradox of desexualization and cultural criticism.

Monica Wittig argues that gender is a socially constructed political concept, and therefore that it ought to be deconstructed:

"Man" and "woman" are political concepts of opposition, and the copula which dialectically unites them is, at the same time, the one which abolishes them. It is the class struggle between women and men which will abolish men and women. The concept of difference has nothing ontological about it. It is only the way that the masters interpret a historical situation of domination. The function of difference is to mask at every level the conflicts of interest, including the ideological ones.

X In other words, for us, this means there cannot any longer be women and men, and that as classes and categories of thought or language they have to disappear, politically, economically, ideologically.⁹¹

Wittig then argues that since sex and gender are socially constructed, they ought to be abolished.

However, it is important to note that Wittig introduces a qualification into her deconstructionism. Judith Butler describes it as follows: "...Wittig calls for the destruction of

⁹⁰ Biddy Martin, "Feminism, Criticism, and Foucault," *Feminism and Foucault: Reflections on Resistance*, eds. Irene Diamond and Lee Quinby (Illinois: Northwestern U. Press, 1988), 14.

⁹¹ Monique Wittig, "The Straight Mind," *Feminist Issues*, vol.1 (summer 1980), 108.

'sex' so that women can assume the status of a universal subject."⁹² In this paradoxical move, Wittig seeks to keep some semblance of gender identity at the same time as she is abolishing the ontological grounds for its stability.⁹³ Butler recognizes the serious implications of the deconstructive approach which flows from a theory that gender and sex are only socially constructed:

But once we dispense with the priority of "man" and "woman" as abiding substances, then it is no longer possible to subordinate dissonant gendered features as so many secondary and accidental characteristics of a gender ontology that is fundamentally intact. If the notion of an abiding substance is a fictive construction produced through the compulsory ordering of attributes into coherent gender sequences, then it seems that gender as substance, the viability of *man* and *woman* as nouns, is called into question by the dissonant play of attributes that fail to conform to sequential or causal models of intelligibility.⁹⁴

Virus - ignores facts vs. theory / harming the innocent

Catholic Attorneys and Journalists Map the Gender Ideology Virus

From the 1990's to the present four persons have done a remarkable work in mapping what I have called the 'gender ideology virus' as it traveled through out the world taking root in willing hosts. Two of these mappers are Catholic attorneys, Mary Ann Glendon and Christopher Smith; and two of the mappers are professional Catholic journalists, Dale O'Leary and Marguerite A. Peeters. Their work to alert the rest of us concerning how gender ideology has gone viral is invaluable and provides a crucial foundation for our further thinking and action.

⁹² Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 1990), 20.

⁹³ Butler, *Gender Trouble*, states: "Wittig appears to dispute the metaphysics of substance, but on the other hand, she retains the human subject, the individual, as the metaphysical locus of agency.", 25.

⁹⁴ Butler, *Gender Trouble*, 24.

At the same time, I am in disagreement about one aspect of the solution the two journalists suggest to overcome the spread of gender ideology. In brief, they argue that we should avoid using the word 'gender' and instead restrict ourselves to using only the word 'sex.'⁹⁵ My argument against this position is that the word 'gender', has already become the common word used for man or woman, male or female on applications for airplane flights, visas, universities, and so on. If we are to simply ignore it, just like ignoring a virus, its distorted version of gender ideology will continue to spread, and isolation to simply the word sex will become increasingly ineffective. Instead I will argue that we should attempt to ransom the word gender, much like John Paul II ransomed the word 'feminism' by introducing the 'new feminism' of the true meaning of feminism which is based on the common good of women and of all persons including men and children.⁹⁶ Before offering some philosophical reasons for ransoming gender reality from gender ideology, I will offer a time-line of the world-wide expansion in gender ideology, with references to the four authors who mapped its expansion.

In 1975, the United Nations organized a world conference in Mexico City for the UN Year of the Woman. In 1994, preparations were being made in different regional meetings of Non Governmental Organizations (NGO's). The regional conference for Latin American met in Mar del Plato, Argentina. At that conference Senora Marta Llama, a Mexican Feminist, proposed a theory of five sexes. Her words sound like a carbon copy of Dr. John Money's theory:

⁹⁵ See Dale O'Leary, "Don't Say Gender when you mean Sex." Available from Pontifical Council on the Laity: Women's Section (January-February 2012), 1-5, here 2; and "Interview with Marguerite A. Peeters on the gender theory," Available from Pontifical Council on the Laity: Women's Section (November-December 2011), 1-2.

⁹⁶ See (Sr.) Prudence Allen, "Ransoming Treasured Words," *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, volume CVI, no. 6 (March 2006): 22-29.

Biology shows that, outwardly, human beings can be divided into two sexes; nevertheless, there are more combinations that result from the five physiological areas which, in general and very simple terms, determine what is called the biological sex of a person: genes, hormones, gonads, internal reproductive organs and external reproductive organs (genitals). These areas control the five types of biological processes in a continuum... A quick but somewhat insufficient classification of these combinations obliges one to recognize at least five biological sexes:

- * men (persons who have two testicles); women (persons who have two ovaries);
- hermaphrodites or herms (in which there are at the same time one testicle and one ovary);
- masculine hermaphrodites or merms (persons who have testicles, but present other feminine sexual characteristics; [and] feminine hermaphrodites or fermes (persons with ovaries, but with masculine sexual characteristics).⁹⁷

In addition to this proposal for five equal sexes, Senora Marta Llama also argued that a person's identity as a man or woman is simply socially constructed. She often spoke of gender and defined it as: "the symbolization that each culture establishes over sexual difference."⁹⁸

During September 1-4, 1994, representatives from 179 governments around the world met in Cairo for a United Nations Program of Action on a variety of global issues. A large group of NGO's met just before the UN in Cairo. At this conference a rather intense argument erupted over the meaning of the word 'gender' which was frequently used in a draft text. American Congresswoman Bella Abzug, tried to redefine gender, or blur distinctions when others tried to stop her.⁹⁹ Bella Abzug's own words reveal deeper philosophical positions. First, following the line of thought that a woman's body imprisons her previously articulated by Simone de Beauvoir in *The Second Sex*, Abzug rejects the significant place of sexual identity within one's gender

⁹⁷ Marta Llamas, "Cuerpo: Diferencia sexual y género", in Dale O'Leary, *The Gender Agenda: Redefining Equality* (Lafayette, Louisiana: Vital Issues Press, 1997), 69-70.

⁹⁸ Llamas, "Cuerpo," in O'Leary, *The Gender Agenda*, 71.

⁹⁹ For a thorough description of the arguments and tactics, see O'Leary, *The Gender Agenda*, 86ff.

identity [“The current attempt by several Member States to expunge the word *gender* from the Platform for Action and to replace it with the word *sex* is an insulting and demeaning attempt to reverse the gains made by women, to intimidate us, and to block further progress.”]¹⁰⁰

Secondly, the argument about roles echoing Betty Friedan’s *The Feminist Mystique* is similarly aggressive: [“We urge the small number of male and female delegates seeking to sidetrack and sabotage the empowerment of women to cease this diversionary tactic. They will not succeed. They will only waste precious time. We will not go back to subordinate inferior roles.”]¹⁰¹

The difficulty is that Bella Abzug’s definition of gender follows the sex/gender Cartesian separation. In her words “The meaning of the word *gender* has evolved as differentiated from the word *sex* to express the reality that women’s and men’s roles and status are socially constructed and subject to change.”¹⁰² In fact, her political position based on a kind of Cartesian unisex equality promoted abortion rights, the social construction of several sexes and genders. In the end, the ‘word’ gender was left vague to mean “as it has been commonly used and understood”, which was the problem in the first place.¹⁰³

It is at this point that gender ideology proponents sought to dominate the discussion and resolutions at the **United Nations Fourth Conference on Women in Beijing, China in 1995** by redefining equality of men and women to mean statistical equality in every kind of work or political situation. As Dale O’Leary summarized it: “The Gender Agenda begins with a false

¹⁰⁰ See O’Leary, *The Gender Agenda*, 87.

¹⁰¹ See O’Leary, *The Gender Agenda*, 87.

¹⁰² See O’Leary, *The Gender Agenda*, 86-87.

¹⁰³ See O’Leary, *The Gender Agenda*, 159.

premise—the differences between men and women are social constructs—and then goes on to demand that this premise be ‘mainstreamed’ in every program and policy.”¹⁰⁴

At this point I would like to interject two antidotal pieces of information. In the first one, Congressman Chris Smith shared with the audience present at his key note address to the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars in Pittsburgh (2004)¹⁰⁵, that he had received anonymously a package which listed the ten or so steps that feminists had decided to take to circumvent the difficulty at that time of changing US law so that it would conform to its agenda. Among these steps was the plan to go first to the United Nations and get certain rights approved there (as it was easier to accomplish) and then return to the United States to argue that this country should conform itself to the international precedent established at the UN. Another step in the plan was to insert their own members into the middle tier of administrators, who took the UN policies and its finances out to all the world, and country by country to make sure they could be put in place. Chris Smith was at the Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing and he worked hard to support the profamily and prolife groups at the conference.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁴ O’Leary, *The Gender Agenda*, 161.

¹⁰⁵ Representative Christopher H. Smith (R.-N.J.), Keynote Address “Pro-Family Prospects in the Congress,” Chapter 1 in Kenneth D. Whitehead, ed., *The Church, Marriage & the Family* (Notre Dame: St. Augustine’s Press, 2007), 1-10. Unfortunately these informal remarks in the context of his lecture are not included in the published written text. It is also worth noting that Chapter 20 in the same published text details the extraordinary negative effect of the “use of rapidly spreading pre-natal sex determination technology for gender-based abortion...” on the world-wide increasing numbers of abortion of female fetuses. See Nicholas Eberstate, “The Global War against Baby Girls An Update,” 341-362, here 362.

¹⁰⁶ O’Leary, *The Gender Agenda*, 193-94.

In the second one, Mary Ann Glendon, Harvard Law Professor, addressed in Denver a group of several women about her experience leading the Vatican Delegation to the UN Conference in Beijing. Before going to the conference she told us about meeting with Pope John Paul II to received some of his guidelines for representing the Vatican's Positions on Woman's Identity in the context of the other kinds of forces and arguments which will be present at the conference. Specifically, when she asked him how he might suggest responding to the multiple genders and sexes lobbies, the Holy Father suggested that she just stand up and say something like the following: "That is absurd. We know that men and women are everywhere in the world the two ways of being a human being."

In her written summary of the Vatican Delegation to Beijing, Mary Ann Glendon provides a welcome insight into the mind of John Paul II and to the conclusions of that conference.

... [o]ur assessment of their [the documents of the conference] pros and cons was communicated to the Vatican Secretariat of State. On Thursday morning, we received the Holy Father's decision: Accept what is positive, but vigorously reject what cannot be accepted.

Accordingly, the Holy See delegation associated itself in part, with several reservations, with the conference documents... A controversy over the word "gender" that loomed before the conference had been largely defused with a consensus that gender was to be understood according to ordinary usage in the United Nations context. The Holy See, however, deemed it prudent to attach to its reservations a further, more nuanced, statement of interpretation, in which it disassociated itself from rigid biological determinism as well as from the notion that sexual identity is indefinitely malleable. In keeping with the Holy Father's instruction to vigorously reject what was unacceptable, my concluding statement was sharply critical of the conference documents for the remaining deficiencies that our delegation had tried from the beginning to publicize and remedy.

The most important political lesson to be taken from the Beijing conference is that huge international conferences are not suitable settings for addressing complex questions of social and economic justice or grave issues of human rights. Unfortunately, there is an increasing tendency for advocates of causes that have failed to win acceptance through

ordinary democratic processes to resort to the international arena, far removed (they hope) from scrutiny and accountability... [They] can be expected to keep on trying to insert their least popular ideas into U.N. documents for unveiling at home as “international norms.”¹⁰⁷

In 2006, the Pontifical Council for the Family produced a *Lexicon: Ambiguous and debatable terms regarding family life and ethical questions*. In this lexicon there are two essays on the meaning of ‘gender.’ In the article called “Gender” by Jutta Burggraf, after tracing the history of the word, the question is left open about whether or not to use the word ‘gender’. While not accepting “the ideology of gender”, Jutta Burggraf proposes a “gender perspective”. She concludes: “This ‘gender perspective’ that defends the right to differences between men and women, and promotes co-responsibility in work and family, should not be confused with the radical proposal used at the beginning of this discussion, that ignores and crushes the natural differences between both sexes.”¹⁰⁸

In the same *Lexicon* Oscar Alzamore Revoredo defines gender in “An Ideology of Gender: Dangers and Scope” drawing from the UN conference in Beijing: “Gender refers to the relations between men and women based on the socially defined roles assigned to one sex or the other.”¹⁰⁹ Then, drawing from his experience of the regional conference at Mar de Plato, Argentina Revoredo cautions: “It becomes clear that the supporters of the gender perspective

¹⁰⁷ Mary Ann Glendon, “What Happened at Beijing,” *Traditions in Turmoil* (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 2006), chapter 37: 301-13, here 310.

¹⁰⁸ Jutta Burggraf, “Gender”, in Pontifical Council for the Family, *Lexicon: Ambiguous and debatable terms regarding family life and ethical questions* (Virginia: Human Life International, 2006): 399-408, here 408.

¹⁰⁹ Oscar Alzamore Revoredo defines gender in “An Ideology of Gender: Dangers and Scope” in *Lexicon*: 465-482, here 466.

were advancing something more reckless, like, for example, ‘a natural man or woman does not exist...’¹¹⁰ These two conflicting positions in the *Lexicon* of ambiguous terms leave the position open for further study and clarification.

The final person to be considered in this section on mapping the virus of gender ideology is Dr. Marguerite A Peeters, Journalist and Director of the Institute of Intercultural Dialogue Dynamics in Brussels, and faculty member of the Urbaniana Pontifical University. Dr. Peeters has written extensively on the ideology of gender and is at the forefront of mapping its intellectual and political expansions. In 2006, in the proceedings of a study seminar sponsored by the Vatican in 2004, Marguerite Peeters stated that:

The concept of gender breaks the ontological unity of the human person by separating the body from an individual’s personal vocation as a man or a woman, a father or a mother, a husband or wife, a son or daughter; it breaks down the Trinitarian image of the human person. It therefore opens the floodgates to every type of possible choice regarding sexual orientation: bisexuality, homosexuality, lesbianism, heterosexuality, all of which are choices that the new ethical system places on the same plane in a form of radical moral relativism.

The deconstruction of the person as a man or as a woman leads to a sexless society, a society without tenderness, a “neutral society without men and without women.”¹¹¹

From my perspective, Dr. Peeters is describing the ideology of gender and not the concept of gender itself. Nonetheless, her article very well maps the strategy of “gender mainstreaming,” from 1968 Teheran, 1974 Bucharest, 1975 Mexico City, 1980 Copenhagen, 1985 Nairobi, and

¹¹⁰ Revoredo, “An Ideology of Gender,” 467.

¹¹¹ Marguerite A. Peeters, “Current Proposals and the state of the debate,” Pontificium Consilium Pro Laicis: Laity Today, *Men and Women Diversity and Mutual Complementarity* (Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2006):73-98, here 80. My emphasis.

1995 Beijing.¹¹² Her work is an invaluable reference for the viral spread of gender ideology.

★ Peeters correctly identifies that “In the gender revolution, the real power is wielded by experts... [who] are given direct access to senior civil servants and all the real decision-makers in every country, in order to be able to exert their influence without hindrance.”¹¹³ And she prophesies correctly that “The gender revolution is spreading like wildfire, albeit silently, without any form of public debate, and without anyone feeling the need to give it any democratic legitimacy.”¹¹⁴

In *The globalization of the western cultural revolution: key concepts, operational mechanisms* Marguerite Peeters elaborates in detail her basic approach to gender. While her mapping of the globalization of gender ideology is excellent, I still disagree with her conclusion to avoid the word ‘gender’ altogether and so will add the bracket [ideology] in my description of her arguments. Peters identifies a ‘gender paradigm’ supported by ‘gender feminists’ who “have established a dialectical distinction between the concept of sex, feminine or masculine, whose differences are written in biology and are therefore unchangeable, and gender, feminine or masculine, whose differences, according to them, are socially constructed, unstable, and changeable.”¹¹⁵

Peeters analyzes the rights- based approach strategy of gender [ideology]: “The first is the integration into human rights of the objectives of the erotic revolution...The second is the integration of socioeconomic development into human rights...;...and the post-modern right to

¹¹² Peeters, “Current Proposals,” 85.

¹¹³ Peeters, “Current Proposals,” 95.

¹¹⁴ Peeters, “Current Proposals,” 96.

¹¹⁵ Peeters, *The Globalization*, 71.

choose.”¹¹⁶ She traces the Gender [ideology] mainstreaming at the UN and its use of “global gender [ideology] specialists through the UN’s Office of the Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women, or OSAGI.”¹¹⁷ In addition, Marguerite Peeters correctly describes a new battleground for gender ideology vs. gender reality in the field of education through a clear agenda from UNICEF for transforming schools in five stages: gender sensitive; gender healthy; gender priority to girl’s education, gender rights of children to express their opinions and to have access to sexual and reproductive health; and evaluation on the children’s positive participation in society.¹¹⁸

In 2008, Marguerite A. Peeters gave a lecture entitled “Gender: an anthropological deconstruction and a challenge for faith” at a conference sponsored by the Pontifical Council for the Laity in Rome on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of *Mulieris Dignitatem*. This lecture begins with the strong claim: “Gender is one of the most harmful categories in the feminist, sexual and cultural revolution that we are experiencing in the West.”¹¹⁹ Here again, Peeters used the word ‘gender’ without the qualifier ‘ideology.’ Later in her presentation, Peeters argues further that “gender is not an ideology in the proper sense of the term,” because it did not flow from a master who created it like Marx and from a systematic great theory. Following this, she

¹¹⁶ Peeters, *The Globalization*, 88-89.

¹¹⁷ Peeters, *The Globalization*, 131-133.

¹¹⁸ Peeters, *The Globalization*, 161-62.

¹¹⁹ Marguerite A. Peeters, “Gender: an anthropological deconstruction and a challenge for faith”, in Pontifical Council for the Laity, *Woman and Man the humanum in its entirety* On the 20th anniversary of John Paul II’s Apostolic Letter *Mulieris Dignitatem*.1998-2008) (Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2010): 289-299.

states that “Gender carries in its wake residue from feminism and Marxism...”¹²⁰. And, later on in her article, Peeters refers to gender ideology’s attack on mothers and on ‘man-woman complementarity.’ Finally, she returns to her simple use of the word ‘gender’ and concludes that “The concept of gender has the revolutionary objective of restructuring society according to a new model of gender equality.”¹²¹ Unfortunately, in this article Peeters goes back and forth between using gender on its own and occasionally introducing the qualifier ideology of gender. It would seem that she still maintains that even the word ‘gender’ always carries with it all the residue of gender ideology.

I was present at this conference, and in a public discussion I raised the question about whether we could ransom ‘gender’ because it was our word from the beginning with its root in Aristotle’s generation of animals and in the book of Genesis in Scripture before it became kidnaped and distorted. It seemed to be at the time that Peeters especially polarized equality with what she called an anthropological complementarity between woman and man. She tended to argue that equality made anthropological complementarity impossible. In my defense of integral gender complementarity (which is a metaphysical theory before it is anthropological), equality of dignity and worth of man and woman is one of its two essential characteristics along with significant differentiation qua man and qua woman as the second essential characteristic.

The Council for the Laity: Women’s Section has left the debate about gender open by being willing to post articles written against the use of the word ‘gender’ by Dale O’Leary and Marguerite Peeters along side with articles written by me in which I use the word ‘gender’ in the

¹²⁰ Peeters, “Gender”, 290.

¹²¹ Peeters, “Gender”, 297.

sense of gender reality.¹²² With the increasing urgency that Peeters and O'Leary are expressing concern about using the word 'gender' it is time to directly make the case for us to ransom its use as part of the new evangelization in this year of Faith.

Characteristics of Gender Ideology 'going' viral

Gender Ideology seeks to dominate through the exercise of power. Its chosen host was the United Nations conferences and organizations. Its method was to attempt to subvert equal participation among those present. Gender Ideology rejects reasoned arguments based on a real understanding of the human person. It provided artificial separation of mind from body and then incoherently brought sexual relations back into gender identity through sexual activity.

Peeters facts vs. theory I have discussed at the Catholic Church

The Personalization of Gender: Ransoming Gender Reality

Through the years I have made detailed arguments in support of a theory of integral gender complementarity. Briefly summarized, this theory argues that women and men are fundamentally equal in dignity and worth and significantly different; and they are called into synergetic relations of love and friendship that are biologically and/or spiritually generative. The framework for this theory is drawn from neo-Thomism in its development in existential Thomistic personalism especially as elaborated by Karol Wojtyla/John Paul II.

¹²² For example, they posted an article by Peeters entitled: "A New Global Ethics. Challenger for the Church, and an interview with Marguerite A. Peeters on the gender theory." They also posted articles by Dale O'Leary on "A Woman's Perspective on Mainstreaming a Gender Perspective," and "Don't Say Gender when You Mean Sex. And during the same time frames they posted articles by me which use gender to mean basically woman and man as the two ways of being human, in *Mulieris Dignitatem* twenty years later; an overview of the document and challenges and Man-Woman Complementarity: The Catholic Inspiration. All Available at www.laici.va/content/laici/en/sezioni/donna/articoli.html

The Gift of Theological Anthropology to Gender Reality

Fides et ratio encourages philosophers to test out the truth of their theories by the anchor of revelation. In the controversial sets of arguments about gender, we are very fortunate to have a clear and unambiguous revelation in Genesis that God created human beings one of two and only two genders, as male and female; and he called them into a union that he mandated to be fertile: “Go forth and multiply and fill the earth.” This revelation to philosophers sets the boundaries for our thought in a very rich way. Pope John Paul II, in his audiences on the Theology of the Body and in his subsequent development in Mulieris Dignitatem summarized that man and women are equally human, that they are equally persons, and that they are significantly different as complementary to one another. These are the two components of the philosophical theory of integral gender complementarity.

The word ‘integral’ means that each woman and each man is a whole person, not a fraction of a person, and the word ‘gender’ includes reference to a sexual starting point as female or male and to the kind of woman or man that a person develops through his or her acts. A person integrates his or her soma, psyche, consciousness, through acts of will and intellect that build on the real potentialities that are present from the start.

Catholic Philosophy’s need of Thomistic Metaphysics for Gender Reality

Thomas Aquinas understood that the human soul has a dual identity; it acts as the form of the body when it organizes it, and it acts as spirit when it is in communication with other spirits. This means that any attempt to define the full meaning of human love between a woman and a man, by a direct analogy with animals is doomed to failure.

Furthermore, without a metaphysical foundation that is open to contemporary science it is not possible to explain how integration occurs within a woman or a man without descending into pure capricious choice as has been brought to our attention earlier in this paper. ¹²³ Bernard Lonergan and M.A. Krapiec. If we think of each human being as having a central substantial form which organizes several hierarchically integrated conjugate forms, we can better understand a how a woman's identity or a man's identity is stable and yet open to spiritual love. Lonergan offers the following description of this complex structure of the human being in *Insight*:

Organic, psychic, and intellectual development are not three independent processes. They are interlocked with the intellectual providing a higher integration of the psychic and the psychic providing a higher integration of the organic. Each level involves its own laws, its flexible circle of schemes of recurrence, its interlocked set of conjugate forms. Each set of forms stands in any emergent correspondence to otherwise coincidental manifolds on the lower levels. Hence, a single human action can involve a series of components, physical, chemical, organic, neural, psychic, and intellectual, and the several components occur in accord with the laws and realized schemes of their appropriate levels.¹²⁴

Sex and gender identity appears in different ways in these complex levels of organization of an individual's identity. Various sciences are uncovering the remarkable complexity of sexual and gender differentiation in many ranges.¹²⁵

Karol Cardinal Wojtyla elaborated in his work *Love and Responsibility* a complex ethical

¹²³ See Manzer, Chris and Sarah Bordon Sharkey. *Feminism and Metaphysics*. Available at; Courseweb.stthomas.edu/.../Siena-journal-09-10.

¹²⁴ Bernard Lonergan, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1968), 470.

¹²⁵ Sr. Prudence Allen, "Metaphysics of Matter, Form, and Gender". *Lonergan Workshop Journal*. Vol 12 (1996): 1-26.

system that directly focuses on sexually differentiated interaction. In this text, the personalistic focus of a woman or man's identity as being developed by acts from within is repeatedly emphasized:

[A]ffirmation of the value of the person can only be the product of the spirit, but the effort is above all positive and creative 'from within', not negative and destructive. It is not a matter of summarily 'annihilating' the value 'body and sex' in the conscious mind by pushing reactions to them down into the subconscious, but of sustained long term integration; the value 'body and sex' must be grounded and implanted in the value of the person¹²⁶.

The understanding of the person as a "psycho-somatic unity that achieves integration precisely through acts of self-governance and self-determination is developed in considerable detail in the text *The Acting Person*. Thus, we build ourselves up to be a particular kind of woman and of many through decisions and acts which build on the somatic foundation we have. It is in the context of this approach to the human person, qua woman and qua man, the multiple characteristics as identified as masculine or feminine over the centuries need to be carefully examined until we reach those characteristics that are really rooted in one's psycho-somatic experience, and which ones are not so rooted.

To follow out the logic of integral gender complementarity that permeates the work of Karol Wojtyla/ Pope John Paul II, even though he did not use the word gender, it is important to note that in *Love and Responsibility*, he identified the root of a woman's genius in the fact that through her cycles she ovulates nearly every month from puberty until menopause. This prepares her body to receive new life and it gives her a propensity to receive the life entrusted to her and to foster its growth. As Aristotle said so long ago, a woman generates in herself. A

¹²⁶ Karol Cardinal Wojtyla, *Love and Responsibility* (London: Collins, 1982), 171.

woman can act against this root of her feminine genius by using birth control that represses ovulation or by having an abortion. So it is not a biological determinism, but rather a gift of her sexual identity that offers her a real potentiality to actualize as she develops her genius in her relations with those in her sphere of activity. John Paul II said further that ~~a~~ in maternity (biological and/or spiritual) she discovers the meaning of her femininity. He always reserves the word 'feminine' for a woman, any woman's way of acting in the world. He never attributes masculinity to a woman.

Analogously, Pope John Paul II suggests that a man has to make a willed choice to adopt a woman and a child as his own (as did St. Joseph) because he is outside of the process of gestation and giving birth. As Aristotle said, a man generates outside of the self. Drawing from his Apostolic Letter on St. Joseph, it seems as though, once a man makes this willed choice to adopt his wife and to adopt his child, then he has a propensity to protect and to provide for them. Again a man can, and sadly often does, act against this propensity. But if he acts instead to support it, John Paul II suggests that a man discovers the meaning of his masculinity in biological/and or spiritual fatherhood. Also he never attributes feminine characteristics to a man.

Just from this brief description of the integrated way that Personalistic philosophy provides a way to integrate sex and gender, while always respecting the spiritual faculties of intellect and will we can see that it provides the way to ransom gender and the theory of integral gender complementarity. Deitrich von Hildebrand was the first philosopher to state that a husband and wife are metaphysical complements. He understood the significance of the metaphysical foundation to hold up the structure of gender reality. St. Edith Stein identified the

not
masculine
woman
feminine
man
but
show
woman
gender
man

by phenomenon)
importance of ovulation in a woman's identity, and Karol Wojtyla drew out the spiritual gifts that
this sexual foundation of a woman's nature offers to her and to the world.



New Evangelization of Gender Reality

In conclusion, I would argue that we need to newly evangelize the meaning and use of the word 'gender' because the concept belongs to us from the beginning, in *Genesis* and in the *Generation* of Animals. It means from its root 'gens' to breed, to generate, to engender, and it demands the collaborative gifts of a woman and a man in union with God. ^{is} It the way we, as man and woman were created by God and mandated to multiply and fill the earth.

error at beginning of sentence

It is perhaps not surprising that it took nearly 2000 years for Aristotle's error that woman provided no fertile seed to be corrected, and her contribution of ovulation to be confirmed. The centuries of denying this reality even in the face of contrary evidence was due, in part, to the pervasive presence of another ideology. It is also significant that today so much effort to promote artificial means of birth control and abortion is being pushed by another form of ideology, gender ideology.

error at beginning of sentence

In this year of faith, let us not abandon the struggle for gender reality, and the true meaning of our identities as women and men.